Applicant : Lance W. Russell
Serial No. : 09/888,544
Filed : June 25, 2001
Page : 5 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 10003533-1
Amendment dated Sep. 6, 2005
Reply to action dated June 6, 2005

Remarks

I. Status of claims

Claims 1-20 were pending.

Withdrawn claims 7-11 and 15-18 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 3, 14, and 20 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 21-27 have been added.

II. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 12-14, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Binding (U.S. 6,775,687). Claims 3, 14, and 20 have been canceled without prejudice.

A. Independent claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended and now recites:

> 1. A method of accessing a data file in a distributed computing environment, comprising:
>
> in response to a request from a client site for access to a data file stored in one or more physical storage systems at a source site, sending from the source site to the client site physical address meta data including physical addresses of one or more logical blocks of the data file in the one or more physical storage systems, and routing meta data comprising one or more node addresses along one or more network routes between the client site and the source site.

In his rejection of independent claim 1, the Examiner has stated that "Binding, FIG. 3D shows a client requests a data file, the server responds with physical address metadata and routing metadata (a redirect to a new URL) 312, the client uses the metadata to access the file 334." The redirect message 312 that is sent by the server 305' in accordance with Binding's approach, however, does not contain physical address meta data that includes physical addresses of one or more logical blocks of the data file in one or more physical storage

Applicant : Lance W. Russell
Serial No. : 09/888,544
Filed : June 25, 2001
Page : 6 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 10003533-1
Amendment dated Sep. 6, 2005
Reply to action dated June 6, 2005

systems, as recited in claim 1. In accordance with Binding's teachings, the redirect message 312 contains a URL and a request header containing requested supplemental information that is specified as a comma-separated list of attribute names. Neither the URL nor the supplemental information request that are contained in the redirect message 312 includes physical addresses of one or more logical blocks of the data file in one or more physical storage systems where the data file is stored at the site of the server 305'. Indeed, the supplementation information name attributes are not physical addresses of one or more logical blocks of the data file in one or more physical storage systems where the data file is stored at the server site. In addition, as is well-known, a URL contains a protocol prefix (e.g., http), a port number (e.g., port 80) specifying a port of the server corresponding to a service provided by the server, a domain name corresponding to the unique network address of the server, subdirectory names, and a file name. None of the elements of the URL is a physical address of a logical block of the data file in one or more physical storage systems where the data file is stored at a server site.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Binding now should be withdrawn.

B.   Claims 2 and 6

Each of claims 2 and 6 incorporates the features of independent claim 1 and therefore is patentable over Binding for at least the same reasons explained above.

C.   Independent claim 12

Independent claim 12 has been amended. The pertinent features of independent claim 12 essentially track the features of independent claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, claim 12 is patentable over Binding for at least the same reasons explained above in connection with claim 1.

D.   Claims 14

Applicant : Lance W. Russell
Serial No. : 09/888,544
Filed : June 25, 2001
Page : 7 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 10003533-1
Amendment dated Sep. 6, 2005
Reply to action dated June 6, 2005

Claim 14 incorporates the features of independent claim 12 and therefore is patentable over Binding for at least the same reasons explained above.

E. Independent claim 19

Independent claim 19 has been amended. The pertinent features of independent claim 19 essentially track the features of independent claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, claim 19 is patentable over Binding for at least the same reasons explained above in connection with claim 1.

III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Binding in view of Bleier (U.S. 6,832,184).

Each of claims 4 and 5 incorporates the features of independent claim 1. Bleier does not make-up for the failure of Binding to teach the features of independent claim 1 discussed above. Indeed, the Examiner has cited Bleier merely for the statement "It is another object of the invention to provide client/server simulation tool employing a generalized LAN frame generator for simulating situations where the serving entity is a finite state machine, and a basic LAN frame generator where the serving entity is relatively stateless" (col. 7, lines 4-8). Therefore, claims 4 and 5 are patentable over Binding and Bleier for at least the same reasons explained above in connection with independent claim 1.

IV. New claims

Each of new claims 21-27 incorporate the features of respective ones of the independent claims 1, 12, and 19 and therefore is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

V. CONCLUSION

Applicant : Lance W. Russell
Serial No. : 09/888,544
Filed : June 25, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 10003533-1
Amendment dated Sep. 6, 2005
Reply to action dated June 6, 2005

For the reasons explained above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Charge any excess fees or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 6, 2005

Edouard Garcia
Reg. No. 38,461
Telephone No.: (650) 631-6591

Please direct all correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599